

REMARKS

The amendment is similar to the amendment filed in response to the prior advisory action, except that the word "machine" in claims 15, 16 and 19 has been changed to "device" consistent with the other terms in the claims.

The Amendment should be entered under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 as 1) overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and placing the claims in allowable condition. There is no other bona fide issue remaining for allowance of the claims, with the long-held and oft-repeated prior art rejection being completely lacking in merit whether the claims are amended or not.

The Amendment should be entered under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 as 2) reducing the issues for appeal.

This Reply is accompanied by a Notice of Appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Michael J. McGovern
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5725
Attorney of Record